DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 100 236 HE 006 136

AUTHOR	Strong, Stanley; And Others
TITLE	Student Demand and Preferences for University Area Housing.
INSTITUTION	Minnesota Univ., Minneapolis. Office for Student Affairs.
PUB DATE	31 Dec 74
NOTE	20p.
JOURNAL CIT	Research Bulletin; v15 n14 Dec 1974
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$1.50 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	Boarding Homes; *College Housing; *College Students; *Dormitories; Fraternities; *Higher Education; Married Students; Residential Schools; Single Students; *Student Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS	*University of Minnesota

ABSTRACT

A survey of 941 randomly selected students on the Twin Cities campuses of the University of Minnesota indicated that 72 percent or an estimated 28,800 students lived or would consider living near the campuses. Of the 28,800 students it was estimated that 11,000 students did not live in the university area but would consider doing so. Both single and married students rated two bedroom apartments as the most desirable accommodation near the university, and one bedroom apartments were rated the next most desirable. Single students also rated other accommodations, such as group living with six or fewer other students, sleeping rooms, fraternities, sororities, and domitories as desirable. Both married and single students did not rate any alternative to apartments as desirable. Both married and single students showed moderate interest in cooperative housing, and both preferred lowrise building apartments to highrise building apartments. (Author)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED100236

HE 006 136

Student Demand and Preferences for University Area Housing

Stanley Strong, Marilynn Egner and Steve Carter

Student Life Studies and Minnesota Student Association

University of Minnesota

The housing policies and supporting statements accepted by the Regents of the University of Minnesota in 1973 focused on the impact of housing on students' university experiences. The statements emphasized the need for healthful housing with sufficient space for study and the need for housing which gives easy access to University resources. The University of Minnesota is located in the center of a large metropolitan area and university students commute to the University from all parts of the Twin Cities area. Also, many students are housed in apartments, houses and University-owned dormitories on or near the University's campuses. Questions have been repeatedly raised of the best balance between residences available for students close to the University versus residences in the larger metropolitan area and of the types of housing needed in the University area. The Campus Committee on Housing (1972) reviewed studies of student housing and attempted to integrate information on existing housing and housing preferences of students. The purposes of the present study, undertaken at the request of the Campus Committee on Housing by the Minnesota Student Association with support from Student Life Studies and Support Services and Operations, was to obtain a gross estimate of the potential student demand for housing in the University area, and to assess students'

preferences for housing types in the University area.

Method

Sample

A random sample of 1,070 students was drawn from the active files of University of Minnesota day students on the Twin Cities campuses during Spring quarter. Of the 1,070 students, 941 or 88% were contacted by telephone or by mail when telephone contact was not feasible. Those contacted were asked if they lived in the University area and, if not, would they consider living in the University area. The 678 who either lived or would consider living in the University area were asked to complete a questionnaire on housing. Responses to the questionnaire were received from 558 or 82% of the 678 students, 434 of whom were single, and 124 of whom were married.

Questionnaire

The questionnaire was developed from a draft suggested by the Campus Committee on Housing (Campus Committee on Housing, 1972). The questionnaire asked students to indicate their housing, rental rate per month, and other identifying information. The bulk of the questionnaire listed alternative housing in terms of basic type and number of roommates sharing the housing, and asked students to rate the perceived desirability of each option on a five-point scale varying from very desirable to very undesirable. Students were also asked how much money they would be willing to pay for each of the options. The housing options concentrated on

apartment units within highrise and lowrise (two and one-half walkup) buildings. In addition, students were asked of their interest in a series of other possible housing types within the University area, such as possible arrangements within dormitories, fraternities or sororities and rooming houses. Several questions assessed students' interest in cooperative housing. In this report, students' ratings of desirability of the various types of housing were combined into the three levels of desirable, neutral and undesirable. Cost data are not presented.

Results

Potential Demand

Six hundred and seventy eight or 72% of the 941 students who were contacted indicated that they either lived in the University area or would consider living in the area. Based on the 72% estimate and on an approximate figure of 40,000 students on the Twin Cities campuses at the University of Minnesota, approximately 28,800 students lived or would consider living in the University area. Of the students who indicated that they lived or would consider living in the University area, 78% were single and 22% were married. These percentages closely approximate estimates in 1970-71 of the percentages of single and married students in the student population of the University (Huebner, 1971). Using figures resulting from an analysis of zip codes of University students' addresses in 1971 (Twin City local address distribution by zip code, 1971), 45% of the student body or 17,688 students lived on or within three miles of the Minneapolis-

St. Paul campuses. Based on the discrepancy between the 72% of the sample who lived or would consider living near the campus and the 45% who lived near the campus in 1971, and using a base of 40,000 to approximate the number of students at the University, we can estimate that about 11,000 students in addition to those currently living within the three mile radius of the University campuses would consider living in close proximity.

Housing of Sample

The housing of students who lived or would consider living in the University area is presented in Table 1 along with the housing of all students on the Twin Cities campuses (Huebner, 1971). Single students and married students are presented separately. Thirty eight percent or 166 single students in the sample did not respond to the question of the kind of housing they occupied. For the rest of the single students, the most frequent housing indicated was apartments with 28% of the single student sample indicating they occupied apartments. Other types of housing were much less frequently indicated with the most frequent being "dormitory" (10%) and "other" (11%). In comparison to the housing types lived in by all students at the University of Minnesota, the most underrepresented group in the sample was single students living with parents or relatives. Fifty seven percent of all students at the University of Minnesota lived with relatives, while only 5% of the sample indicated they lived with parents or relatives. Even if all of those

students not responding to the item lived with parents or relatives, there still would be a 20% discrepancy between the total student population and the students in the sample. Twenty one percent of all students lived in apartments while 28% of the sample lived in apartments. It seems likely that some of the students who did not respond to the item also lived in apartments, suggesting single student apartment dwellers were overrepresented in the sample. The percentages of students in dormitories, fraternities and sororities, own home, and sleeping rooms were approximately equivalent to the total student population.

For married students, the percentages are quite similar between the sample and all married students. For example, 63% of the married students in the sample live in apartments as compared to 61% of the total married student population at the University. The largest discrepancy is in the "own home" category: 34% of the married students in the student body lived in their own home, while only 13% of the students in the sample did. Compared to single students, married students were much more heavily clustered in apartments and houses, with the other options of dormitories, parents and relatives, fraternities, and sororities much less used.

Table 2 presents sample students' ratings of satisfaction with their housing. Most single students (76%) who lived in apartments were satisfied. Equivalent or higher satisfaction

was expressed by students living in "other" (79%), "own home" (75%), and "fraternity or sorority" (100% satisfied). The most dissatisfied single students lived with parents or relatives (57% satisfied, 24% dissatisfied), in sleeping rooms (50% satisfied, 12% dissatisfied) and in dormitories (61% satisfied, 18% dissatisfied).

Married students' satisfaction with their housing was higher than was single students' satisfaction. Seventy eight percent of married students who lived in apartments reported that they were satisfied, 85% living in their own homes, and 87% of those living in "other" accomodations reported they were satisfied.

Desirability of housing types in the university area

Table 3 presents single students' and married students' ratings of the desirability of apartments in highrise buildings and for different numbers of roommates. For single students, the most desirable housing type was a two bedroom apartment shared with one roommate (58% rated the option as desirable). Nearly as desirable was a one bedroom apartment with no roommates (51% desirable) or one roommate (49% desirable). All other options were endorsed as undesirable by 49% or more of the students. Two of the options rejected by the majority, two bedrooms with no roommates and three bedrooms with no roommates or one roommate, suggest a consideration for the expense of such arrangements for one or two persons. Most other options required sharing bedrooms with another person, or sharing the entire living space with

two or more persons. For example, sharing a three bedroom apartment with three, four, and five roommates was seen as undesirable by 68%, 82% and 89% respectively of the single students in the sample. Likewise, sharing one bedroom with two roommates was seen as undesirable by 7?%, sharing two bedrooms with three roommates was seen as undesirable by 70%, and sharing no bedroom with one roommate was seen as undesirable by 64%.

The pattern of married students' desirability ratings for apartment types in highrise buildings was very similar to the pattern for single students, given that married students answered the questions in terms of sharing apartments with roommates in addition to their spouses and children. For them, no roommates was the equivalent of one (or more) roommate for singles. A two bedroom apartment with no roommates was the most preferred option for married students (47% desirable), followed closely by one bedroom apartment with no roommate (39% desirable) and three bedrooms with no roommate (27% desirable). All other options are strongly rejected by married students, with undesirable ratings ranging from 82% to 100%.

Table 4 presents single and married students' ratings of desirability of apartment sizes and numbers of roommates in lowrise buildings. The pattern of desirable ratings is the same for lowrise buildings as for highrise buildings. Single students preferred two bedroom units with one roommate (67% desirable), one bedroom with no roommates (62% desirable), one bedroom and one roommate (57% desirable) and an efficiency with no roommate

(50% desirable). They most strongly rejected a one bedroom with two roommates (75% undesirable), two bedroom with three roommates (63% undesirable), and an efficiency with one roommate (60% undesirable). The married student pattern, allowing for their pre-existing roommate, followed the same pattern. Desirable were two bedroom apartments with no roommate (65%) and one bedroom apartments with no roommate (52%). Married students strongly rejected all other options ranging from efficiency apartments with no roommate (83% undesirable) to one bedroom apartments with two roommates (98% undesirable). Comparing the highrise and low-rise housing preferences, married and single students preferred lowrise building options to highrise building options in all cases. The degree of preference, while not large, was consistent.

Table 5 presents student interest in six alternatives to high-rise and lowrise apartment building units. Single and married students were most interested in apartment dwellings in dormitory buildings. Seventy six percent of single students and 61% of married students expressed interest in apartment units with living and sleeping areas, kitchen and bath within on-campus dormitory buildings. Single students expressed a nearly equal interest (75%) in houses rented to at most six persons where each person has his own room. Less desirable but still seen as interesting by sizeable minorities of single students were housing units shared by six or more persons (45% interested), on-campus dormitories (40% interested), sleeping rooms (38% interested), and fraternities and

sororities (30% interested).

Married students showed little interest in options other than apartment units in dormitories. Twenty five percent expressed an interest in houses rented to at most six persons, but 85% or more married students rejected all other options.

Students' ratings of their interest in cooperative housing are presented in Table 6. Thirty eight percent of single students and 45% of married students indicated interest in cooperative housing. Twenty five percent of married students were definitely not interested while only 12% of single students were not interested. Around 50% of both single and married students indicated a willingness to be actively involved in resident managed housing. While 41% of single students were willing to take a passive role in resident management, only 28% of married students were willing to do so.

Discussion

The estimate of 28,800 students who lived or would consider living in the University area yields an estimate of 11,000 students who did not live near the University but would consider doing so. Whether these students would move close to the University would depend on whether housing of the kind they preferred was available and whether it was available at a price they would be willing to pay. The "hard" demand for new housing given realistically possible rental rates and amenities would surely be considerably less than 11,000. The market figure generated by this

study of 28,800 compares to the figure of 20,210 estimated in the Cedar-Riverside Market Survey of 1970. The housing projects planned for 1970 to 1974 (Campus Committee on Housing, 1972) were heavily weighted toward moderately to very expensive units and thus, in all probability, will not be particularly attractive to most of the 11,000 students potentially in the market for the increased supply of housing in the University area.

Students who lived or who would have considered living near the University compared to the general student population were more likely to dwell in apartments, less likely to live with parents or relatives, and, if married, were less likely to own their homes. Students dissatisfied with their housing were likely to live with their parents or relatives, in sleeping rooms or in dormitories.

The most desirable type of housing for single and married students whether in highrise, lowrise or dormitory buildings was two bedroom apartments. Single students preferred arrangements with their own room and with common space shared with one individual. The desirability of housing decreased as students needed to share their room and as they needed to share the common space with more than one other individual. It is important to note that married students and single students saw the same housing alternatives as desirable. Single and married students compete directly with each other for the most desirable space. With an insufficient supply of desirable housing, and provided that

married students have less money to spend on housing than do two single students collectively, married students can be expected to be squeezed out of the market. In this case the need for University sponsored low cost apartment type housing is greater for married students than for single students.

The ratings of alternatives to apartment units in low and highrise buildings pin-point students' preferences for apartments. However, single students considered as desirable a wide variety of other housing including group living, dormitories, fraternities, sororities, and rooming houses. Married students did not see as desirable any alternative to apartments.

Both married and single students indicated a moderate degree of interest in cooperative housing. The greater willingness of single students than married students to adopt a passive role in the management of cooperative housing suggests that single and married student cooperative housing might experience different levels of active participation. The overall preference of students for lowrise apartments suggests that the fill rates of highrise buildings would lag behind that of lowrise buildings near the University.

References

Campus Committee on Housing. Student housing at the University of Minnesota: A research compendium. University of Minnesota Housing Office Report, 1973.

Huebner, J.M. Where students live 1970-1971, (the thirteenth annual demographic analysis of total enrollment, Minneapolis and St. Paul campuses by residence, college, age, and marital status, 1970-1971). University of Minnesota Housing Office Report, 1971.

Twin City Local Address Distribution by Zip Code. University of Minnesota Housing Office Report, 1971.

Table 1

Percentages of Sample and Twin City Campuses Students[a]

Living in Housing Types

Housing Types	Single Students		Married Students	
	% Sample[b]	% Campuses[c]	% Sample[d]	% Campuses[e]
Apartment	28	21	63	61
Dormitory	10	8	2	0
With Parent or Relative	5	57	1	4
Fraternity or Sorority	4	3	0	0
Own Home	1	3	13	34
Sleeping Room	2	2	0	1
Other	11	0	18	1
Non-response	38	4	6	0

[a]Data from Huebner, J.M. Where Students Live 1970-1971. University Housing Office Report, 1971.

[b]N = 434

[c]N = 34,370

[d]N = 124

[e]N = 8,607

Table 2

Students' Satisfaction Ratings of their Housing[a]

	Single Students				Married Students			
Housing	N	Sat.	Neu.	Dis.	N	Sat.	Neu.	Dis.
Apartment	128	76	10	14	78	78	9	13
Dormitory	41	61	20	18	2	100	0	0
With Parents and Relations	21	57	19	24	1	100	0	0
Fraternity or Sorority	16	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
Own Home	4	75	25	0	13	85	8	8
Sleeping Room	8	50	38	12	0	0	0	0
Other	52	79	10	12	23	87	0	13

[a]Presented in terms of percentages of students rating themselves as Satisfied, Neutral or Dissatisfied with their housing

Table 3

Student Desirability Ratings of Apartment Sizes and Number of Roommates in High Rise Buildings[a]

Apartment Size and Number of Roommates[b]	Single Students[c]			Married Students[d]		
	Des.	Neu.	Undes.	Des.	Neu.	Undes.
Efficiency						
No roommates	36	14	49	10	8	82
One roommate	25	11	64	1	2	97
One Bedroom						
No roommates	51	14	35	39	7	54
One roommate	49	12	38	7	2	91
Two roommates	12	9	78	4	4	93
Two Bedrooms						
No roommates	14	8	77	47	9	44
One roommate	58	15	27	12	10	76
Two roommates	39	11	50	3	9	76
Three roommates	22	8	70	2	2	97

Continued on next page

[a]Presented by percent of students' ratings of Desirable, Neutral and Undesirable within each size - roommates option. Some row total percentages for single and for married students do not equal 100% due to rounding error.

[b]For married students, roommate is in addition to spouse and children.

[c]Number of single students rating housing options varied from 350 to 421.

[d]Number of married students rating housing options varied from 106 to 120.

Table 3 Continued

Apartment Size and Number of Roommates[b]	Single Students[c]			Married Students[d]		
	Des.	Neu.	Undes.	Des.	Neu.	Undes.
Three Bedrooms						
No roommates	6	5	89	27	14	59
One roommates	13	10	76	10	6	84
Two roommates	32	10	57	2	4	95
Three roommates	20	12	68	0	0	100
Four roommates	10	7	82	0	0	100
Five roommates	7	4	89	0	0	100

[a]Presented by percent of students' ratings of Desirable, Neutral, and Undesirable within each size - roommates option. Some row total percentages for single and for married students do not equal 100% due to rounding error.

[b]For married students, roommate is in addition to spouse and children

[c]Number of single students rating housing options varied from 350 to 421

[d]Number of married students rating housing options varied from 106 to 120

Table 4

Student Desirability Ratings of Apartment Sizes and Number of Roommates in Low Rise Buildings[a]

Apartment Size and Number of Roommates[b]	Single Students[c]			Married Students[d]		
	Des.	Neu.	Undes.	Des.	Neu.	Undes.
Efficiency						
No roommates	50	13	38	12	5	83
One roommate	30	9	60	3	0	97
One Bedroom						
No roommates	62	11	27	52	10	38
One roommate	57	11	32	4	4	92
Two roommates	14	11	75	1	1	98
Two Bedrooms						
No roommates	22	11	67	65	8	27
One roommate	69	10	21	14	9	78
Two roommates	43	15	42	5	4	91
Three roommates	29	7	63	3	1	96

[a]Presented by percent of students' ratings of Desirable, Neutral, and Undesirable within each size - roommates option. Some row total percentages for single and for married students do not equal 100% due to rounding error.

[b]For married students, roommate is in addition to spouse and children

[c]Number of single students rating housing options varied from 373 to 415

[d]Number of married students rating housing options varied from 109 to 116

Table 5

Student Ratings of Interest in Alternatives to High and Low Rise Building Apartments[a]

Alternative	Single Students[b]		Married Students[c]	
	Int.	Not Int.	Int.	Not Int.
Apartment units with living and sleeping areas, kitchen and bath within on-campus dormitory	76	24	61	39
House rented to at most six persons where each person has own room	75	25	25	75
Group of more than six shared kitchen and bath, common eating and recreational spaces	45	55	15	85
On-campus dormitory	40	60	12	88
Rooming house with sleeping room and shared kitchen	38	62	8	92
On-campus fraternity or sorority house with room and board provided	30	70	4	96

[a]Presented by percent of students' ratings of Interested and Not Interested within each alternative. Some row totals for single and for married students do not equal 100% due to rounding error.

[b]Number of single students rating alternatives varied from 357 to 430

[c]Number of married students rating alternatives varied from 106 to 122

Table 6

Students' Ratings of Interest and Willingness to Manage Cooperative Housing[a]

Item	Single Students[b]			Married Students[c]		
	Yes	Neutral Don't Know	No	Yes	Neutral Don't Know	No
Interested in cooperative housing which is owned and/or operated by residents?	38	51	12	45	30	25
Willing to take an active role in resident managed housing?	41	26	33	42	32	26
Willing to take a passive role in resident managed housing?	41	33	27	28	42	31

[a]Presented by percent of students' ratings of Yes, Neutral or Don't Know, and No for each question. Some row totals for single and for married students do not equal 100% due to rounding error.

[b]Number of single students rating items varied from 404 to 427

[c]Number of married students rating items varied from 110 to 115